

# NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III.

SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1834.

NO. 30.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK  
AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY

T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or \$2.50 if not paid  
within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Cham-  
ham-Square, (foot of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-  
street, Philadelphia.

Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-  
Square, New-York."

[Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year  
1834, by P. PRICE, in the Clerk's Office of the  
Southern District of New-York.]

## ANSWERS

TO

### "213 Questions without Answers,"

By D. De Vinne,

WITH REJOINDERS,

By A. C. Thomas.

92. As sin presupposes temptation of some sort,  
who tempted a holy angel to sin?

A. The Scriptures reveal to us very little  
concerning Fallen Spirits; but upon their au-  
thority we may make the following statements  
which will show us, how a Holy Angel might  
sin, *without* the presence of any thing that was  
evil in itself, or, without an immediate Tempter.

1. Those Angels who kept not their first es-  
tate were created holy. 2. They had the lib-  
erty of choice, which is essential to a rational  
accountable creature. 3. They were in a  
state of probation, being under law to God. 4.  
This state of probation was such that in order  
to maintain that state of purity in which they  
were created and to acquire those habits of hol-  
iness which would confirm them in righteousness  
to all eternity, it was necessary that they should  
watch, pray, and *exercise* the complete do-  
minion over the *will* and every *appetite* or ten-  
dency. Sensitive beings so constituted must  
have had feelings, appetites or propensities.—  
These must be felt; and from curiosity or some  
apparently harmless circumstance, before these  
probationary beings were confirmed in habits of  
holiness, they might even wish to be gratified,  
although the commandment or moral principle  
forbid it. Now, this very wish, however small  
in degree, unless it was *immediately* suppressed,  
would beget a tendency which would operate to  
*unsettle* the perfect adjustments in the moral  
constitution of such a holy being. This tenden-  
cy, by the frequent presentation of the desired  
object, would increase, and now, the least vol-  
untary indulgence, though it be only in thought,  
would *fix* this wrong tendency and cause it to  
break out in some overt commission of sin.

Let us suppose the law of God to be a straight  
line marked out for a holy free agent to walk  
upon; to keep on this line care and watchfulness  
are necessary; one of a thousand objects, though  
none of them are evil in themselves, may catch his  
eye, and for want of proper attention, may lead  
him off of this line. Suppose this free agent,  
to be wanting in attention, and by not suppressing  
the smallest, the most incipient desire or ten-  
dency as shown above, should at last step off of  
this straight line. Now by this one wrong step,  
it is impossible to say how much he has *deran-  
ged* the nice adjustments and duly balanced pro-  
portions of moral nature; for these adjustments

and proportions constitute his holiness and up-  
rightness. If *one* wrong step thus deranges, a  
repetition of them would produce a fixed habit,  
and in this way the moral constitution would  
be *spoiled*; and thus a holy angel, though he  
were in a place, where nothing that was evil  
surrounded him and though there were no im-  
mediate Tempter whatever in existence, might  
sin, become corrupt, and finally depraved in  
his settled character.

Rej. As to the 'angels which kept not their first estate,'  
it remains to be proved that they were other than human  
beings like ourselves. The respondent ought to know, that  
the word *angelos* is repeatedly translated *messenger*. And  
it was shown in the preceding rejoinders, that the ministers  
of the churches in Asia, are termed angels, in the Apoca-  
lypse.

The question under consideration, was not designed to  
call forth an answer, as to the manner in which mankind  
are tempted to sin—but simply related to the supposed  
temptation and subsequent transgression of a holy angel in  
the realms of glory. Milton has treated this subject with  
a masterly hand, so far as the imagination of a fine poet is  
concerned—but the Bible is entirely silent as to the defec-  
tion of any of the holy inhabitants of the celestial world.

The respondent alleges that the holy angels who sinned,  
"had the liberty of choice, which is essential to a rational  
accountable creature." As to any *liberty of choice*, so far  
as wrong doing is concerned, no being can possess it, and  
still be accountable. Power of choice in this matter, is not  
denied, so far as creatures surrounded with *objects* of choice  
are concerned. Choice is in the *object*, and not in the  
*mind*. But what object of choice can exist in heaven, suf-  
ficiently attractive to create in a *holy* angel a *will* to do  
evil?

Besides—If holy angels possessed *liberty of choice*, as  
to any thing evil—and if such liberty be essential to a ra-  
tional accountable creature, such liberty must still be pos-  
sessed by all the celestial hosts! And what guaranty have  
we that the saints in glory will not abuse this liberty, and  
finally, fall into condemnation? To say that they have  
been confirmed in holiness, does not destroy the force of  
the question; for however confirmed they may be, still they  
must have liberty to do evil, if such liberty of choice be es-  
sential to a rational creature. To allege that *they cannot*  
*possibly choose to do wrong*, is in effect to say, that their *lib-  
erty* to do wrong, is a mere matter of moonshine. And to  
grant that even those who are confirmed in holiness have  
still liberty to choose evil, is to admit that they *may* choose  
it; and then comes in the previous question, what guaranty  
have we that they *will not*?

The respondent allows in the holy angels "a will, appetite  
or tendency to do wrong. This amounts to a concession that  
they were not *holy*. If a *will*, or disposition to do wrong, is not  
an *unholy will*, I am at a loss to understand the meaning of  
language. Before an evil suggestion can be suppressed, it  
must exist—and the existence of an evil desire, in however  
small a degree, proves that the possessor is not a holy  
being.

Pride is generally spoken of as the sin of the holy angels.  
But what could have originated pride in such beings? What  
tempting influence could create it? A *tendency to pride* is  
an *evil tendency*, inasmuch as *pride* is itself an abomination  
in the sight of God. An appetite to do wrong, is an *evil* ap-  
petite; and a *will* to depart from the law of God is, in the  
view of the new covenant, tantamount to actual transgres-  
sion. "He that hateth his brother is a murderer," even  
though blood be not shed. And an angel that could, in the  
least degree desire any thing in non-conformity to the will  
of God, could not have been holy, aside from all considera-  
tions of overt transgression.

I may add, that *innocence* and *holiness* are not, in my judg-  
ment, synonymous terms. Adam was *innocent* previously  
to transgression—but he was not *holy*. A child is innocent,

but not *holy*—for it has in its nature the elements of passion.

"The lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eyes, and the pride  
of life"—these are the originators of evil thoughts and of  
wrong doing. But tempters like these can have no influence  
on the celestial inhabitants. They are not simply *innocent*—  
they are *holy*. "Without holiness, no man can see the Lord"  
—and it is presumable that no *angel* was ever permitted to  
see the Lord, unless he were possessed of such perfect pu-  
rity of thought, such sublimity and yet humility of feeling,  
such innate submission to the Divine will, as would forever  
preclude the possibility of a rebellion or fall.

93. If an *angel* could sin without a Devil to tempt  
him, may we not sin without a Devil to tempt  
us?"

A. Yes, we, as free agents might have sin-  
ned as other free agents, or as the fallen Angels  
have done.

Rej. Then surely the Devil is a useless being! And  
why allege that the denial of the existence of this useless  
being "would be to nullify all law?" etc.

94. If a holy angel was tempted to sin by surround-  
ing evil, is heaven a holy place?

A. Yes, Heaven is a holy place. But your  
supposition is wholly wrong: The sin of Fallen  
Angels originated in *themselves* as already shown  
on No. 92, and not by temptation from sur-  
rounding objects. Free agents before they are  
confirmed in habits of holiness, may sin without  
the presence of evil to tempt them: they may  
love lawful things in an unlawful degree; thus,  
bread is good, but by not exercising a proper  
dominion over the appetite, one may eat too  
much, derange the healthy adjustments of his  
system and bring on himself disease and death.

Rej. The respondent allows that sin originated in the ho-  
ly angels *themselves*. Shall we trace an *unholy stream* to a  
*holy fountain*? Bread is certainly good, and it is evil to  
eat too much. But the comparison fails. Evil is not good  
in any sense—be it little or much.

95. If an angel was tempted by evil passions, could  
he have been *holy*?

A. But we do not allow the truth of your  
suppositions, they were not tempted by evil  
passions. See on 92.

Rej. But the respondent has allowed that those holy an-  
gels possessed "a will, appetite or tendency," to do wrong.  
And I have shown that this is evil—call it a *passion*, or  
what you please. In one word, so soon as you can point  
me to a Scripture passage which declares, that "the holy  
angels were created subject to vanity"—or that assures me  
they were placed in heaven on trial—then, and not till then,  
can I allow the *bare possibility* that a holy angel ever sinned.

96. If an angel became a Devil by sinning, was Ad-  
am's the *original* sin?

A. Not in reference to other beings, but it was  
original as it respects our own race, being the  
first one.

97. If Adam became mortal, (that is, subject to  
death) by sinning, must he not have been created  
immortal?

A. It is most probable that he was.

98. If Adam had been created immortal, could he  
ever have died?

A. Yes, but you must not confound death  
with *annihilation*; for it is not used in the sense  
of extinction of being in any part of the Bible.  
Therefore on account of sin, Adam could have  
died, and by it, actually did die a bodily and  
spiritual death and was made *liable* to an eternal  
one. By a bodily death, we mean the separa-  
tion of a rational soul from the body. By spiri-  
tual or moral death, the separation of the soul



from communion with God, which state is known by the *extinction* of those holy, grateful and vigorous *affections* that this union always produces, and is represented in the Scriptures as one, in which the soul is *dead in trespasses and sins*. In the highest sense it means eternal punishment of the immortal soul, by the loss of happiness, the separation of communion with God and the infliction of pain.

*Rej.* The liability of any man to "eternal death," has not the slightest *shadow of a shade* of countenance in the Bible. And as to the assertion that "death," in "the highest sense, means eternal punishment of the immortal soul," it is as baseless as the incantations of a sorcerer are ridiculous.

I do not confound death with annihilation. This perpetual endeavour to evade the force of a plain question, is a tacit admission that an unequivocal answer would scatter the creeds of men to the winds. If Adam became subject to natural death by sinning, he must have been originally immortal—and in this case, he could not have died. A dead immortality is a paradox. The immortality of any being or thing, as such, must forever exclude the ideas of change, decay and death. The Almighty informed Adam that he should return to the dust of the ground, not because he had sinned, but because he had been made of the dust. Natural death is the effect of a mortal constitution—while moral death is the effect of sin. And as to the phrase "eternal death," it does not occur in the Bible.

99. If Adam sinned without inheriting total depravity, why should inborn depravity be assigned as the cause of our sins?

A. Because, Adam dying that spiritual death which I have stated, and "begetting a son in his own likeness," transmitted to all his posterity that nature which is prone to be "Carnal Sensual and Develish," and this scriptural view of man's fallen state, is corroborated by daily observation, which shows, that the first emotions of children, previous to their being taught, or learning from example, do *universally* partake of stubbornness, self-will, pride and anger. However, though "inborn depravity" gives the mind at first the wrong tendency, yet when man comes to a state of accountability, grace, or "a manifestation of the Holy Spirit is given him," so that he can resist this evil inclination if he will; but if he does not, then he consents to the original transgression, incurs actual guilt and is liable to punishment.

*Rej.* A man can no more transmit his moral qualities to posterity, than he can his intellectual. My great-great-grandfather was a Welshman, but I understand not a word of Welsh. His knowledge of the language was not *inherited*—nor were his moral qualities transmitted to him by his ancestors. Physical general character may be transmitted from generation to generation; but every thing pertaining to morals or intellect must be the results of education and habit. Depravity pertains to *morals*, and cannot be transmitted. Children, consequently, are born into the world in as pure or innocent a condition as that in which Adam was created. My observation teaches me that children do not "universally partake of stubbornness, self-will, pride and anger." Expression of passion in infants cannot be traced to moral in-born depravity—for it is obvious that this cannot be transmitted from parent to child. Physical infirmity, constitutional weakness, or bodily pain, or something of this character, is the only justly assignable origin of infantile perversity.

The question has not been definitely answered. Adam inherited no depravity from his ancestors—for ancestors he had not—yet he sinned. Why, then, should the Doctors of Divinity so strenuously urge that the sins of men are mainly attributable to in-born depravity? If our first parent sinned without such depravity, why may not his posterity sin in like manner?

100. Would there be any more impropriety in imputing my sins to Adam, than in imputing his sins to me?

A. The framer of this Question appears to have altogether a wrong view of the imputation of sin. The Scriptures nowhere say that the *guilt* of Adam's sin, is imputed to his posterity but only the *legal result* or consequences which follow upon it. Suppose a Father of good prop-

erty, should lose it by gaming and intemperance, and destroy his health, so that he could not provide for his children; in this case, without any crime of theirs, the sin of the Father would be imputed to them, that is, the legal results or natural consequences of his sin would deprive them of that property which was necessary to educate them and they would be sent to the Poor House, or brought up in ignorance.

*Rej.* The illustration in the foregoing answer is based in the assumption, that Adam by sinning lost something, and that by his sin we lose the same thing—which is all the respondent understands by the imputation of sin. What did Adam lose? His innocence. Granted. But children are now born as innocent as Adam was created. So the illustration is *sophistical*—for the children of the father never possessed the estate that the father lost. In order that the illustration may be perfect, we will state it thus: The father had an estate; he lost it by gambling. The children had an estate; they lost it in the same way. Where, then, is the imputation of the father's sin? Nowhere. The father experienced the legal results of *his own sin*—the children suffered the legal consequences of *their own sin*. So as to mankind. Adam's sin concerned himself alone, so far as the condemnation of guilt had any bearing on the matter. And as to the fact that his ejection from Eden prevented his posterity from enjoying the garden, I look upon this as an allegory. *All children* are born in Eden—that is, in a state of innocence—and from the happiness thereof nothing but *their own sin* can eject them. So that to talk of the imputation of sin to any other than the person guilty of it, amounts to language which expresses no idea.

101. If men are totally depraved by nature, must not children be so likewise?

A. Yes, until Christ, the second Adam, who is a *quickening spirit*, visits them; for the purpose of *infusing* into their corrupted nature a measure of that grace, which if they do not resist, *will restore* them to spiritual life and the favor of God. Observe, this grace is ever *active* a manifestation of which is given to every one, producing in them good desires, inciting to good and dissuading them from evil; so that *no soul is ever lost, but for personally, willfully and repeatedly rejecting* the grace of God which might have saved them.

*Rej.* All the question required was, to know whether infants are *TOTALLY DEPRAVED*—and the respondent has assured us that they are. A mother, then, holds in her arms a mass of moral corruption. Its innocent prattle, its winning voice, its care-beguiling manner—all these are but the fruits of *total depravity*!

102. If children be totally depraved, is it true, that "of such is the kingdom of heaven?" Mark x. 14.

A. Yes, for they are still in a state of initial salvation. Before they reach a state of accountability, there is no physical nor moral *impediment* in the way to prevent this active grace from removing this "inborn depravity" and fitting them for Heaven. As they have never willfully sinned against God, so as to incur guilt, they are not required to repent, and as they are incapable of knowing who the Lord is, they cannot believe, consequently Divine grace meeting with no opposition may at any time remove this inborn depravity and take them to Heaven.

*Rej.* When our Lord and Master said "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," He did not say, "the kingdom of heaven is composed of such as these will be when their total depravity is removed," but "of such [of such as these children are] is the kingdom of heaven." He *blessed* them as such and not as what they might become. If children be totally depraved, then, according to the Savior's testimony "Except ye be converted and become totally depraved," "ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven."

103. Men are to be washed from their sins. If they be totally depraved, what is there to wash?

A. Their souls, which are tinged with sin.

*Rej.* That which is *only tinged* cannot be *totally filthy*. It is obvious, that if men are totally depraved by nature,

there is nothing but total depravity to wash! You might as well attempt to wash a handful of mire!

104. If "evil men and seducers *wax worse and worse*," 2 Tim. iii, 13, can they be *totally* depraved at first?

A. Certainly. For although the soul, by nature is dead in trespasses and sin, yet at the first there is in it a *susceptibility* to receive the softening, warming influence of Divine life; but by resisting this grace, that tenderness may be *hardened*, blunted; the conscience may be seared, they may wax worse and worse, and finally, become impervious to all good. Their last state may be worse than the first.

*Rej.* Here is new philosophy. That which is *totally bad*, may become *worse*! An entirely black crow may become blacker—a perfectly round ball may be made rounder!

105. If human reason be "carnal and delusive," why did Jehovah say, "Come now, and let us *reason* together?" Isa. i, 18.

A. But we do not allow that reason is delusive. It is that "columb of true majesty in man," and by it we investigate the evidence on which Revelation is founded. All truth, no doubt is *capable* of demonstration, to those who have *capacity* to understand the demonstration; but we must remember that in our present fallen state, there are many truths too profound for us to comprehend; a greater compass of knowledge, and a stronger intellect will no doubt, make all that plain which now may appear so very mysterious. In our present condition, it is the highest act of right reason to receive whatever Heaven has revealed, and implicitly to follow it, in its plainest, most obvious meaning, not trusting to our own weak and fallacious speculations.

106. If reason be delusive, why should some folks reason against the use of reason?

A. If they do, they show their folly.

*Rej.* I am pleased to perceive that the respondent condemns the folly of thousands of his brethren in the faith of endless misery. Reason has too long been practically abused and vilified. It is high time that her voice should be heard and her teachings regarded. "He who *will not* reason is a bigot; he who *cannot* reason is a fool; he who *dare not* reason is a slave."

#### OMINOUS.

In the proceedings of the "Revival Meeting" held in Dr. Lansing's Church on the 6th inst. we find the following among the resolutions passed on the occasion:—

"Resolved, That the spirit of controversy tends to grieve the Holy Ghost, to destroy revivals of religion, and to impair the spirituality and the usefulness of all those who indulge in it."

What are we to understand from the foregoing official expression? Have our partialist friends taken new alarm? Is the "spirit" of inquiry too much abroad to suit their circumscribed views and feelings? Doubtless it may be. But friendly reader what think you of the honesty and integrity of a body of professed teachers in Israel, who can thus deliberately place the seal of silence on the lips of all over whom they can exert any influence? Is there not manifestly a fear of "coming to the light?" But answer the queries to thy own satisfaction, and draw thy own conclusions. For ourselves, we are satisfied. To us the resolution speaks an unequivocal language.

P.

Br. W. I. Reese, of East-Bloomfield, has accepted an invitation to settle with the Universalist society in Buffalo.

Br. J. Boyden, jr. of Berlin Conn. has accepted an invitation to settle with the Universalist society in Dudley, Mass.

Br. Justus Gage, 2d has removed to York, Liv. co. N. Y.

A general assortment of Universalist Books are kept constantly for sale, by Br. Allen Fuller, of Newberry Court House, S. C.



**"QUESTIONS FOR A UNIVERSALIST TO ANSWER."**

The following questions, with the above caption, appeared in a late No. of the Philadelphian. They are accompanied as will be seen, by a few remarks of the editor of that paper, the Rev Dr. Ely.

"First. If all men will be saved, what need is there of a day of judgment?"

Second. If all men will be saved, why are we told that Christ will divide the world as the shepherd divides the sheep from the goats, and say to those on his right hand, "come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world, and to those on his left, depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels?"

Third. If all men will be saved, why are we exhorted to repent?"

Fourth. If all men will be saved, why are we told the rich man lifted up his eyes in hell, crying that he was tormented in the flame, and begging for a drop of water to cool his tongue?"

Fifth. If all men will be saved, for whom was hell prepared?"

Sixth. If all men will be saved, what is the use of endeavoring to live a moral and religious life?"

AN INQUIRER.

**Remarks.**

If the Inquirer will read the late numbers of the Philadelphian, he will learn how modern Universalists would answer his questions. They deny that there is to be any future day of general judgment; regard this as the only world of retribution; and affirm that in the next life all men will in their state and character be reconciled to God. How far these representations accord with or contradict the Bible our readers must judge."

We shall be permitted to remark that the questions betray a pitiable ignorance, not only of Universalism, but of the very first principles of Christianity. We will answer them, however, out of respect to the paper in which they appeared, and not because they deserve a reply.

To the first question, then, we answer, It is not an incontrovertible fact that there will be "a day of judgment," by which we understand "An Inquirer" to mean a day of general judgment in the future state. He merely assumes what needs to be proved, and then endeavors to oppose Universalism by urging that assumption. But even here his objection has no force. For if it were granted that there shall be such a day of judgment, it by no means follows that all men will not be saved. God is a just God and a Savior. He judges, condemns, and punishes the guilty and yet does not torment them forever. We ask in turn, If the fate of every man is sealed for eternity when this mortal existence closes, as Protestant believers in endless misery contend, "what need is there of a day of judgment?"

To the second question, we reply as above, that "An Inquirer" assumes that the parable of the sheep and goats teaches the popular doctrine of a future general judgment, and the final separation of the righteous and wicked. This is not only assumption, but assumption without the shadow of proof, and capable of being shown to be totally false. There are few propositions susceptible of clearer proof than that the whole 24th and 25th chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel relate to events long since passed. The "Inquirer" is referred to the correspondence now going on between Dr. Ely and Mr. Thomas.

In the third question, we confess ourselves unable to see even the semblance of an objection to Universalism. Can "An Inquirer" suppose that Universalists do not believe in repentance? The salvation which Christianity effects is a salvation from sin. To this, repentance is necessary. Now if all

men shall be saved, all men must repent. Hence the universal exhortation. But if only a part of mankind are to be saved why, we ask, are "all men everywhere commanded to repent?"

To the fourth question we reply by reminding "An Inquirer" that he seems to take for literal history what is in reality a parable. And on the language of a parable he predicates one of the most awful doctrines that could ever enter the imagination of man or devil,—a procedure which sets at defiance every principle of rational exposition. The parable furnishes no evidence of the doctrine of endless misery.

The fifth question discovers the strength of prejudice—"For whom was hell prepared?" Here as before our sage Inquirer takes it for granted that there is a hell, a place of endless torment. This has never been proved, and never can be proved from the Bible. The question however seems to imply that God determined to damn a part of the human race, and afterward prepared a hell for them. This is Calvinism without disguise.

The sixth question is shocking to Christianity.—Had an ignorant heathen put it us, we should have thought it consistent enough with his character. But for a professed Christian to ask such a question, and to publish it through a Christian paper to the world, we cannot but regard as shameful in the extreme. "If all men will be saved, what is the use of endeavoring to live a moral and religious life?" Does this Inquirer wish to apprise us of the fact that all the Presbyterian morality and religion in the country is founded on the fear of endless misery, and that without this fear constantly before them they would at once throw aside both their morality and religion? Can he see no use in living a moral and religious life, other than eventually escaping the torments of hell? Has he no love to God or man? Is he destitute of every principle that deserves commendation? We are happy to inform "An Inquirer" that Universalists "live moral and religious lives" because they love God, and find their happiness in obeying him.

"The fear o' hell 's the hangman's whip  
To hau'd the wretch in order."

With the Christian, thank God, there are other and higher motives. He has learned that "perfect love casteth out fear," and that God asks, and can only approve, the ready service of a willing mind.

As the Philadelphian has published the Questions, will it have the goodness to copy the preceding answers. S.

**THE UNIVERSALIST AND LADIES REPOSITORY.**

The second vol. of this work has just closed. Br. Smith states that he began the vol. with seven hundred subscribers, and closes it with seventeen hundred, and the number is rapidly increasing. This is certainly a rapid advance, but the paper is good, and worthy of all its increase. The next or 3d vol. commences on Saturday June 8. It is published semi-monthly at No. 127 Washington-st Boston, by Br. D. D. Smith, Editor and Proprietor, at \$1, in advance—\$1 25 in three months—\$1 50 in six months, or \$1 75 at the close of the year. P.

**A GENUINE REVIVALIST.**

A friend who called on us a short time since from Oswego, states that during the extraordinary revival efforts in that place for a time past, one of the actors, (Myrick we believe his name was,) in one of the meetings, said that "Whiston, [Br. O. Whiston the Universalist preacher who resided there the year past,] was an angel of light compared to the old Presbyterian, the Baptist, Episcopal and Methodist clergymen, (naming them;) for he (Whiston) came out frankly and let the world know what he was, while the others were effectually leading their

hearers down to hell, through their lukewarmness and sloth!"

Now we are strongly inclined to believe that this Revivalist is above half right. If the doctrine of endless misery is true, there are far too many of its advocates sadly deficient in duty. If they saw their fellow creatures rushing off an awful precipice, they would not remain thus idle and unconcerned. The very air would ring with their warning voices, and they would even forsake their cushioned seats, and rush in person to the rescue. But in affairs of religion, they profess to see millions upon millions of their fellow creatures plunging off the precipice of hell, and yet they can talk as coolly over it, sabbath after sabbath, as a politician would discuss a bottle of Champaign. Is it consistent? P.

We have neglected noticing, for 3 or 4 weeks, a letter under date of April 9th from a friend in Wayne co. Penn. It having got mislaid must be our apology. He informs us that they contemplate forming a Society in Honesdale this Summer, that there are a good many Universalists in those parts, and that a preacher is much wanted. They are about ascertaining what they can raise for the support of a preacher, on a Circuit through four villages, viz. Honesdale, Bethany, Mount-Pleasant and Canaan. These villages are all within the compass of fifteen miles, and the writer has no doubt a preacher can be abundantly sustained there. We know of no one in this region whom we can send them. Perhaps this may meet the eye of some one who can make them a visit. P.

**ANOTHER LABORER.**

The last Inquirer and Anchor states that "Br. John Garley, a young man of promising talents and excellent moral character, has just commenced preaching the doctrine of a world's salvation."

A young man also, by the name of William Whitney, of Hyannis, Mass. has lately commenced preaching the doctrine of Universal Salvation.

**PROPOSALS**

For publishing in Montgomery, Alabama, a new Religious Journal to be entitled  
**THE SOUTHERN EVANGELIST.**

This paper, as its name imports, will be the messenger of "good tidings." It will be the advocate of that system of religious faith which acknowledges God as the impartial friend and Father of all men, and hence the necessary inference that all his offspring will finally be happy in his glorious presence. It will also be the uncompromising foe of all partial, mangrieving, God-dishonoring "creeds and confessions," and of every scheme or device which has for its object the thralldom of a generous people to the unhallowed control of a few "Lords spiritual." It will expose error—"bring to light the hidden things of darkness,"—defend the truth as witnessed by Christ, the Prophets and Apostles, and, in the language of an illustrious statesman, proclaim "eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

By the Universalists of the Southern States especially, will the EVANGELIST be found a steadfast friend and prompt "defender of the faith they rejoice in believing." The Editor is a native of the South, and will aim to make his periodical worthy of the generous support of all the friends of Liberal Christianity from the Carolinas to Louisiana. The patronage of such is therefore respectfully solicited.

**TERMS.**

The SOUTHERN EVANGELIST will be published monthly on a royal sheet, octavo form, (making a volume in the year of near 200 large pages,) at \$1 per annum in advance, or \$1 50 at the end of the year. The right is reserved of publishing semi-monthly, if the patronage will justify it, at a corresponding increase in price. The usual discount allowed to agents.—Letters (post paid) to be addressed to

L. F. W. ANDREWS, Montgomery, Ala.  
April, 1834.



Original.

## THE GOLDEN IMAGE.

There are few histories recorded in Scripture, that are fraught with more interest and instruction, than that which is found in the third chapter of the prophet Daniel, and which relates to the erection of a golden image on the plains of Dura, by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. This haughty monarch, in the pride and vanity of his heart, had set up an image, before which, he commanded his subjects to bow, under the awful penalty of being cast into a burning fiery furnace. With respect to the image, there is no other information given than, its dimensions and component materials. Its height, including the pedestal, probably on which it stood, was above thirty yards, and its breadth, or thickness, about three; and inasmuch as it was made of pure gold, it must have cost immense treasure. What this image was intended to represent, is a matter of speculation. Some have thought that it was an image of the king himself, who, like other mighty monarchs, did not scruple to claim from his subjects divine honors. Others have conjectured that it was rather intended as an emblem of his empire; while the generality of commentators, have supposed it to have been the image of Bel, the chief idol of Babylon. Be this as it may, the royal authority of the monarch was identified with the worship of the image. *Nebuchadnezzar the King, had set it up*, therefore, the people were to fall down and worship it.

We would wish to moralize the subject as we proceed. Do we pity the infatuation of this vain-glorious mortal? let us look around us, and we shall see the exercise of the same arbitrary power, the same absolute dominion, though in a narrower circle. The tyrant's character is not confined to the Imperial throne. It is exhibited in all the various scenes of public life. It may be found within the confines of many a domestic circle. Every neighborhood has its little monarch, whose caprice and humour give the law to those who are dependent upon him. Every scheme which the great man conceives; every plan which he thinks proper to prescribe, must be adopted, not merely without opposition, but even without discussion or enquiry. The measure may be useless; nay, it may be objectionable; it may be a violation of the laws of God and man; it may be such as no considerate individual could conscientiously approve; but what of that? It is sanctioned and recommended by the petty sovereign; and therefore, whether right or wrong, you must tamely acquiesce. The king has set the image up, and if in common with your fellows, you do not bow down and worship, you are — a marked man.

It would be well if modern Nebuchadnezzars would confine their images to the things of this world, but they must league with the church, and set up their idols for religious worship. How often is the fancy of some domestic tyrant kindled, because an individual of his household refuses to worship at his favorite shrine, and offer incense on his accustomed altar. The son, the wife or the domestic, sees no beauty in the god he worships. It is true that to him it may be "an image of gold," and so far his interests may be identified with it; but instead of a lovely being, it is a hideous, ill-shapen monster. They would turn from this heathen idol, to worship the God of love and salvation. But as "the king's command is urgent," they must bow down to his creed; they must adjust themselves to the standard of his practice; they must see Christianity through the medium of his prejudices; they must go to the same place of worship. They must approve what he approves, and condemn what he condemns. His pride demands an entire submission to his will and judgment, and the hot furnace of his displeasure awaits the rebellious subject. Between charac-

ters of this description, and the king of Babylon, I see no difference, except what arises from external circumstances. Their spirit is precisely the same.

But Nebuchadnezzar, exalted and powerful as he was, found those who dared resist the unrighteous decree. Three youths, who held honorable stations in the province of Babylon, and whose names were Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, could not be prevailed upon, either from the hope of continued favor from the king, or fear of the horrid infliction of punishment that awaited them, to violate the dictates of their conscience, and despise the command which says, "thou shalt not bow down and worship." To the command of the king, their firm reply was, "we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." This refusal called down upon them the utmost fury of the tyrant, and he caused his furnace to be heated seven times hotter than usual, and the disobedient youths to be cast therein. But the God whom they served, did not desert them in this extremity, and they passed through the fiery trial uninjured, while he who issued the unrighteous decree, became himself a worshipper of that God who alone could effect such a deliverance.

The time has been, when power was vested in the church, and those who dared to worship otherwise than she prescribed, expiated the daring crime at the stake. Happily this period had passed away, at least on this continent, and the arm of persecution is stayed. But Nebuchadnezzar's spirit still burns in the bosom of those who would compel all to worship the god which they have set up, and accordingly they threaten, (it is all they can do) the despisers of their idol, with the undying flames of an eternal hell. The image on the plains of Dura, had nothing to recommend it, except that it was of gold, and sanctioned by the royal authority. It was therefore necessary to attach some severe penalty to disobedience, or men could not have been induced to bow before the senseless image. The god of orthodox imagination, is equally revolting. There is no comeliness or loveliness about him. To be sure, the touch of priestcraft has converted him to gold, and our advancement and prosperity in life is almost identified with bowing down before him; and therefore, thousands do him homage outwardly, who despise him in their hearts. Again, tens of thousands, believing the stories of the priests, worship him through fear. They see in prospect the heated furnace, they fancy themselves seized hold upon by grim devils, and damned spirits, and in an agony of tears, they bow down to the very dust. Such is the worship which this idol extorts—it is founded on the hope of reward and fear of punishment. A principle of obedience, engendered by love, can never emanate from contemplating a character so grossly represented. We are not informed what was the form or figure of the Babylonish image; but if the orthodox god should be painted, he should be represented with "a purse in one hand, and a whip in the other." C. F. L. F.

## THE GOODNESS OF GOD.

"The Lord is our judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King, he will save us."

What heart does not leap for joy, and swell with adoration at this joyful and soul-inspiring declaration? All surely that are freed from the bondage of fear, and the fetters of superstition. All whose minds have become emancipated from the thralldom of error, over whose souls, the powerful breath of divine inspiration has driven the dense fog that has gathered there beneath the cover of heathenish darkness! All, I say, that have been "ransomed from the prison house" "will sing unto the Lord a new song, saying, bless the Lord, Oh, my soul, and all that is in me, bless his holy name," for "the

Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Law-giver, the Lord is our King, He will save us." Greatly do I commiserate the condition of that benighted soul who looks through the gloomy mists of superstition with fearful forebodings towards the throne of God, and behold the everlasting Judge clothed with vindictive justice—the Supreme Law-giver attended with the scorching lightnings of Mount Sinai—the Almighty King swaying the tyrants sceptre over the defenceless beings which He Himself has made. And whilst fear chains every faculty of the soul, and fell despair is pictured in every feature, imagination paints the direful scene, the tremendous day which God has appointed, in which He will judge the world! Oh cruel—cruel doctrine, and thou promulgator of these sad tidings of despair, look ye into the troubled soul, and behold the fruits of your doings! You have perverted the ways of the most High, before the eyes of your listeners—you have armed him with sword and dagger, and clothed him with wrath and vengeance. You have instilled the moral poison of endless death into the human heart, which has dried up the fountain of life, and annihilated the joyful hope of immortality! Thus have you fed your listeners till despair has spread itself deep and wide over the whole soul! Reflect, O thou destroying angel, and weep and wail with damned spirits! "But hear ye deaf, and look ye blind, that ye may see." "Fear not," saith the Lord of hosts, "fear not, for I am with thee, I will bring thy seed from the East, and gather thee from the West. I will say to the North, give up; and to the South, keep not back; bring my sons from afar, and my daughters from the ends of the earth,—Bring forth the blind people that have eyes, and the deaf that have ears. I, even I, am the Lord, and beside me there is no Savior. I have declared, and have saved, and have showed when there was no strange God among you, therefore ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, that I am God, yea, before the day was, I am He, and there is none that can deliver out of my hand, I will work and who shall let it." In all our researches after divine truth, no one object that presents itself to our inquiry is of so vast importance to the happiness of mankind as a correct knowledge of the character of our God. It is important from the consideration that men will take for their standard of right and wrong, those attributes which they in their imagination, have ascribed to Deity. Do they believe him possessed of hatred, wrath and revenge? they will also cultivate those principles in their own bosom. Do they believe that love is the pre-eminent and darling attribute of Deity? This heavenly principle will influence them to deeds of benevolence, charity and good will.—*Universalist Watchman.*

"I have often observed, in the course of my experience of human life," says a celebrated author, "that every man, even the worst, has something good about him; though nothing else but a happy temperament of constitution, inclining him to that virtue. For this reason, no man can say in what degree any other person, besides himself, can be with strict justice called wicked. Let any of the strictest characters for regularity of conduct among us, examine impartially, how many vices he has not been guilty of, not from any care or vigilance, but for want of opportunity, or from some accidental circumstance intervening; how many of the weaknesses of mankind he has escaped, because he was out of the line of such temptations; and what often, if not always, weighs more than all the rest, how much he is indebted to the world's good opinion because the world does not know all. I say any man, who can thus think, will scan the failings, nay the faults and crimes of mankind around him, with a brother's eye."



## MESSENGER &amp; UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1834.

The senior Editor will preach in New-London, Sunday 25th inst. (to-morrow;) at Westerly, R. I. on Monday and Tuesday evenings, 26th and 27th inst.; at Preston, Conn. on Wednesday evening 28th inst.; and at Norwich on Thursday evening, 29th inst.

Br. N. Dodge will supply his desk in New-York.

The "Young Men's Universalist Institute" meet every Thursday evening at 8 o'clock, in a hall situated at the N. E. corner of the first alley in 8th street, below Walnut, Philadelphia. Entrance from the alley.

## THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

[From the Philadelphian of May 15, 1834.]

To Mr. Abel C. Thomas.—Letter 8.

Philadelphia, May 9, 1834.

Dear Sir—The divinely inspired Paul informed the Athenians, that God who made the world, and all things therein, 'now commandeth all men every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness; by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance to all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead,' Acts xix, 30, 31. Paul did not affirm that God had judged the world, but that he hath appointed a day in which he will do it—You cannot say that the day of judgment thus appointed to take place at some time after Paul's speech in the midst of Mars-hill, was the time of Christ's coming in judgment on Jerusalem; for Paul was speaking to Greeks who had no special interest in that city; and he informed them that God required *all men every where* to repent, because God had appointed a day in which he will judge all mankind, whether Jews or Gentiles. He alleges, moreover, that Christ's resurrection from the dead was sufficient proof of the truth of his assertion concerning the future judgment of the world; thereby clearly implying that the world of mankind are to be raised from the dead as Jesus was, that they may be judged. In this way the Athenians evidently understood the Apostle, for 'when they heard of the resurrection of the dead some mocked.'

In this judgment the Apostle John prophetically "saw the dead small and great, stand before God; and the sea gave up the dead that were in it; and death and hell (*hades*) delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works," Rev. xx, 13. All who are under the power of death are to be restored to life; and all who are in *hell*, *hades*, the state of departed spirits, are to be brought forth to judgment; and after this resurrection there is to be no more natural death, nor any one subsisting in a disembodied state in the world of spirits. In this *sense death and hell* are to be destroyed; and therefore it is added in figurative language, 'and death and hell were cast into the lake of fire.' That this *hell*, *hades*, which is to be destroyed, does not mean the future state of punishment I allow. It is granted also, that this word *hades*, rendered *hell*, primarily denotes the state of departed spirits, whether they are blessed or miserable, and not necessarily any place or state of punishment, in that state of departed or disembodied souls; for Christ *descended into hell* (*hades* in Greek, *sheol* in Hebrew) and God *did not leave his soul in hell*, that is, in the state of disembodied spirits, but raised him out of it, and reunited his soul to his body, without suffering his body to see corruption.

Although, however, *sheol* and *hades* rendered *hell*, do not always imply the misery of those who are in the state of departed spirits, yet frequently it is manifested that there is a *Gehenna*, a *hell of fire*, a state of punishment in *hades*. There is a *Paradise*, and there is a *hell of fire* in the state of departed souls of men.

When it is said, Psalm ix, 17, 'the wicked shall be turned into hell; and all the nations that forget God,' the word *hell*, *sheol*, of itself would not prove that a state of punishment is intended; for Jacob said, 'I will go down into the grave, [*sheol*, *hell*,] to my son mourning,' Gen. xxxv, 35; but since the wicked and the nations that forget God are contrasted with others, and it is evidently the intention of the Psalmist to denounce some evil upon them, we must think that by *turning the wicked into hell* he means something more than the dying of the righteous and the wicked. If punishment in *sheol*, *hell*,

or the state of the dead, is not intended, the wicked might answer, 'well, what then? If we are to be turned into hell so are the righteous, and they and we shall come to the same glorious end. The nations that forget God shall fare as well as those that remember him.'

That *sheol*, *hades*, *hell*, frequently denotes a state of punishment in a world of spirits is evident from many passages of Scripture. In Deut. xxxii, 22, Jehovah says of the idolatrous Israelites, 'a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell.' In the Septuagint it reads, *eos hadou kato, to the lowest hades*. The highly favored Israelites, who, without excuse, 'have moved me to jealousy by that which is not God,' I will punish, saith Jehovah, by reducing them to the lowest state of misery in the world of departed spirits. In connection with this burning of his wrath against them in *hades* and as a prelude to it he denounces those temporal judgments which were to bring them down to hell. 'Mine anger,' saith he, 'shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains. I will heap mischiefs upon them: I will spend mine arrows upon them. They shall be burnt with hunger, and devoured with burning heat, and with bitter destruction. To me belongeth vengeance and recompense; their foot shall slide in due time. See now that I, even I am he, and there is no God with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand; for I lift up my hand to heaven and say, I live forever. If I whet my glittering sword, and mine hand take hold on judgment; I will render vengeance to mine enemies, and will reward them that hate me.' Do these things denote no worse evil than natural death, which shall come alike on the righteous and the wicked? If temporal judgments alone were intended, why should he remind us that *he lives forever*, as if the vengeance taken by him were to be experienced forever, in the lowest hell?

The dying thief upon the cross was assured by Christ that on the day of his death he should be in *paradise* with his Lord. Christ died, and entered *hades* the world of spirits; and so did the penitent thief. But while in *hades* Christ was in *paradise*, and so was the pardoned malefactor. That *paradise* in *hades* means a state of pure and perfect happiness you do not deny. That in *hades* there is a state of suffering and punishment you deny; but in 2 Peter ii, 4, we read, that 'God spared not the angels which sinned, but having cast them down to hell in chains of darkness, hath delivered them to be reserved unto judgment.' Here the expression rendered *having cast them down to hell* is *Tartaros*, having cast them down, or turned them into *Tartarus*. The term refers not to the grave or natural death merely, but to a state of punishment in the invisible world, which, in the days of Peter, the Greeks and Romans called *Tartarus*. The heathen doubtless entertained erroneous notions about the locality of this *Tartarus*, and have written many unscriptural things about it, but still it was the name of a state of punishment, a prison of despair in the world of spirits; and the Spirit of inspiration by using it has clearly taught, that there is a state of punishment to which the angels which sinned have been confined, that may properly bear that ancient and classic name. For our present purpose it is a matter of no importance to decide whether these angels were spiritual beings never incarnate, or the souls of some who once were messengers on earth: Some angels are in *Tartarus*; and there in a state of confinement are reserved to a future judgment. PARKHURST says, 'The ancient Greeks appear to have received by tradition, an account of the punishment of the fallen angels, and of bad men after death; and their poets did, in conformity, I presume, with that account, make *Tartarus* the place where the giants who rebelled against Jupiter, and the souls of the wicked were confined. Here saith Hesiod the rebellious *Titans* were bound in penal chains. But as the Greeks imagined the earth to be of a boundless depth so it must not be dissembled that their poets speak of *Tartarus* as a vast pit or gulf in the bowels of it.' Hesiod calls it—

"Black Tartarus within earth's spacious womb."

In Homer's *Iliad* viii, Jupiter threatens any one of the Gods who should assist the Trojans, saying, 'I will throw him into darksome *Tartarus*,' and declares that he will bind him in chains under darkness. In another part of the same *Iliad* Pope translates the father of the Grecian poetry thus:

"No sun e'er gilds the gloomy horrors there,  
No cheerful gales refresh the lazy air,  
But murky Tartarus extends around."

Indeed had Peter been a learned man, independently of inspiration, we should have thought he was quoting HOMER as literally as Paul did some of the *Athenians* and *Cretans* (Acts xvii, 28, and Titus i, 12,) but as he was not, we come to the conclusion that the Holy Ghost introduced this *Tartaros* into the sacred oracles on purpose to refute the false doctrine that *hell* means nothing but the grave or the state of the dead.

'On the whole then,' says PARKHURST, '*Tartarus* in St. Peter is the same as *riptein es Tartaron*, to throw into *Tartarus*, in Homer, only rectifying the poet's mistake of *Tartarus* being in the bowels of the earth, and recurring to the true original sense of that word above explained, which, when applied to spirits, must be interpreted *spiritually*; and thus *Tartaros* will import that God cast the apostate angels out of his presence into that *zophos tou skotous*, blackness of darkness (2 Peter ii, 17, Jude ver. 13,) where they will be forever banished from the light of his countenance.'

This *Tartarus*, or state of future punishment of which Peter speaks, is called by Christ the *hell*, or *gehenna* of fire: and both expressions refer to the same thing. Christ derived the name which he employed to denote the state of future endless misery from scenes familiar to the Jews; and Peter from the conceptions of the Greeks and Romans. The *gehenna* or *hell of fire* is the very opposite to the *paradise of God*, to which the soul of the repentant thief went with the Redeemer on the day of the crucifixion.

In Matt. v, 29, 30, Christ twice employs the word *gehenna*, when he warns men to pluck out a right eye, and cut off a right hand, lest the 'whole body should be cast into *hell*.' Had he employed the word *hades* it might have denoted the *grave*, or merely the world of future existence; but to be cast into *gehenna* was to be cast into a state of which the *valley of Hinnom* was a fit emblem. It is in this *gehenna* in the state of the dead, in which Christ says God is able to destroy both soul and body.—Matt. x, 28. It is the damnation or the judgment of *gehenna*, *hell*, and not of *hades*, merely, which is spoken of by our Savior when he asks hypocrites, extortioners, persecutors, murderers and unclean persons, 'How can ye escape the damnation of *hell*?' Matt. xxiii, 33. By the damnation of *gehenna*, and by *destroying soul and body in gehenna*, after men had killed the body, our Savior certainly meant some dreadful evil. *Gehenna* we allow was a compound word from two Hebrew words which signify *Vale of Hinnom*. So *Spirit* literally signifies *air*, *breath*, and *wind*; and *heaven* the *sky* or *azure vault* over our earth. *Man* also literally means *red earth*. Shall we therefore assert that *Gehenna*, *Spirit*, heaven and man, mean now in common language nothing more than the natural objects whence the names were derived?

'This *valley of Hinnom*,' says PARKHURST, 'lay near Jerusalem, and had been the place of those abominable sacrifices in which the idolatrous Jews burned their children alive to Molech, Baal or the Sun. A particular place in this valley was called *Tophet*, and the valley itself the valley of *Tophet*, from the *fire-stove*, Hebrew *Topheth*, in which they burned their children to Molech. From this valley's having been the scene of these *infernal sacrifices*, and probably too from its continuing after the time of King Josiah's reformation a place of abominable filthiness and pollution, the Jews in our Savior's time used the compound word *Gehinnom* for *hell*, the place of the damned.' This appears from that word's being thus applied by several Jewish comments, called *Targums*, to which he refers. The truth of this representation may be learned by reading 2 Kings, xiii, 10, in which place it is said of Josiah, 'he defileth *Topheth*, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech.' 2 Chron. xxviii, 2, 3. Ahaz 'walked in the ways of the kings of Israel, and made also molten images for Baalim. Moreover, he burnt incense in the valley of the son of Hinnom, and burnt his children in the fire, after the abominations of the heathen.' From Jeremiah xix, we learn that the prophet was sent by the Lord to prophecy in this valley and say, to those who built 'the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings unto Baal—behold the days come, saith the Lord, that this place shall no more be called *Tophet*,



nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of Slaughter. And the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses of the kings of Judah, shall be defiled as the place of Tophet." It is evident from these passages that *Gehenna* was the name of a place of pollution, punishment, and the service of false and cruel gods. What more expressive or suitable term could have been chosen to denote the state of sin and misery and irreligion beyond the grave? The expression *gehenna of fire*, was probably chosen to denote the punishment of hell, because of the fires employed in the service of Molech, and the fires subsequently employed perpetually in burning the offals of Jerusalem.

"The Rabbins assure us," says CALMET, "that this idol [Molech] was of brass, sitting upon a throne of the same metal, adorned with a royal crown, having the head of a calf (or steer) and his arms extended as if to embrace any one. When they would offer any children to him, they heated the statue within by a great fire; and when it was burning hot, they put the miserable victim within his arms, which was soon consumed by the violence of the heat; and that the cries of the children might not be heard, they made a great noise with drums and other instruments about the idol."

Having compared the future state of the wicked to *gehenna*, and their punishment and pollution to fire and worms, Christ assures us of the perpetuity of all the three, by declaring that their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched. "If thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell (*gehenna*) into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire: where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." Mark ix, 43-48.

In my apprehension it has thus been sufficiently proved, that in *hades*, the world of departed spirits, there is a *paradise*, a state of holy happiness with Christ, for all his people, and a *gehenna of fire*, *Gehenna tou puros*, into which the wicked are cast: and that the fire of punishment in this *gehenna of hades*, this hell of the future state, is everlasting; for it shall never be quenched.

My heart's desire and prayer to God is that you and I, and all for whom we should pray, may escape this dreadful hell. EZRA STILES ELY.

To Mr. Ezra Stiles Ely.—Letter 8.

Philadelphia, May 17, 1834.

Dear Sir—I have repeatedly stated that a passage which was future in its reference when spoken or written, is not necessarily future in its reference now. Disregarding this statement and its obvious bearing, you again cite Acts xvii, 31, and argue, that if God HAD judged the world, Paul would not have declared that "he hath appointed a day in which he WILL judge the world in righteousness." I have several times referred you to the fact, (by emphasising the passage,) that God was thus to judge the world, under the Gospel, "BY THAT MAN whom he had ordained;" or as in Rom. ii, 16, "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men BY JESUS CHRIST, according to my Gospel." But this surely does not suppose that God had not previously judged the world HIMSELF. It is written, "He is a God who judgeth in the earth," Psalm lviii, 11. The Father, however, "committed all judgment unto the Son," John v, 22; appointed him a kingdom, Luke xxii, 29, and a day or time to reign—in proof of which, numberless passages might be adduced, were it necessary. Jesus came in his kingdom before the close of the generation in which he lived Matt. xvi, 27, 28. Then commenced the day in which God was to judge the world in righteousness BY THAT MAN to whom all judgment had been committed. Paul certified the Athenians, not that mankind should be raised from the dead to be judged in the manner stated, but that God had raised his Son from the dead as an assurance that he would judge the world by that man whom he had ordained.

In reference to your citation of Rev. xx, 13, I may remark, that I profess little acquaintance with the hyperbolical instructions of the Apocalypse. Commentators of every sect have acknowledged their ignorance as to the meaning

of many portions of the book; and neither of us would loose any thing, in the estimation of judicious persons, were we to unite in a similar acknowledgment. Though I shall not attempt to explain the meaning of the passage you have quoted, I may call your attention to the following considerations:

1st. The passage contains nothing that will justify you in assuming that the *literally dead* are spoken of—nor that the dead were restored to life before they were judged. John saw the "DEAD stand before God"—not the *living*. The difficulty is removed by allowing that the *morally dead* are signified.

2d. In another part of your letter you state, that *hades* is the place of departed spirits, in which there is a *paradise* and a *gehenna of fire*. But the passage before us declares, that not only *death* and *hades*, but THE SEA gave up the dead. You do not suppose that the sea is a place of departed spirits—how then could the sea deliver up what it did not contain? To affirm that the sea simply gave up *dead bodies*, is to yield your whole argument—for you proceed on the assumption that departed spirits were the subjects of the judgment.

3d. You alledge that "it is added in *figurative language*, 'and death and hell were cast into the lake of fire.'" What authority have you for supposing that one part of the matter is *figurative* and the other *literal*? In endeavoring to remove a difficulty which you were aware would arise, you have destroyed your entire argument—for it is obvious, that, if the casting of death and *hades* into the lake of fire be understood *figuratively*, the giving up of the dead by death, *hades*, and the sea, must also be understood *figuratively*. Where, then, is your argument?

4th. In the previous chapter we have some account of a battle between the beast and him who sat on the horse. The beast and the false prophet were taken, and "cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse. . . . and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." Here the lake of fire is spoken of—but no one discovers the propriety of applying such language to the concerns of a future state of being.

5th. In the first verse of the Apocalypse it is written: "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must SHORTLY COME TO PASS." And in the last chapter we read as follows: "Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book; for the time is at hand. . . . And behold I COME QUICKLY; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be."

6th. You have certified us, that in *hades* there is a *paradise* and a *gehenna of fire*. According to your statements of the destruction of *hades*—the paradise of which you speak and Tartarus, and *Gehenna* are to be destroyed and exist no more. Why, then, do you contend that Tartarus signifies a state or place of endless punishment? Why do you make the same use of the word *Gehenna*? And why do you quote passages in which the word *hades* occurs, in proof of endless punishment? You have told us that *hades*, and consequently Tartarus, and *Gehenna*, are to be destroyed, blotted out of existence. Where, then, is your endless hell? You will say, perhaps, "it is the lake of fire." You can have no other answer. Why, then, do you cite passages in which *hades*, *gehenna*, or *tartarus* occurs? According to your own argument, the entire proof of endless punishment rests on the phrase "lake of fire." And now, sir, I respectfully and earnestly solicit you to present your reasons for supposing that this lake of fire is in the immortal state of being. I beg you to remember, that you must either prove this point, or admit that the Bible knows of no endless hell.

You quote Psalm ix, 17, and Deut. xxxii, 22. In these passages the word *sheol* occurs. Dr. Campbell says: "In the Old Testament the corresponding word [corresponding to *hades*] is *sheol*, which signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery. . . . It is plain that in the Old Testament the most profound silence is observed in regard to the state of the deceased, their joys or sorrows, happiness, or misery." 6th Preim. Diss. Part ii, §2, 19.

Dr. Jahn says: "The belief of the ancient Hebrews on this subject was, that the spirits of the dead were received into *Sheol*, which is represented as a large subterranean abode, Gen. xxxvii, 35, comp. Num. xvi, 30-33. Deut. xxxii, 22. Into this abode, we are told, that the wicked are driven suddenly their days being cut short; but the good descend into it in tranquility, and in the fullness of their years." Archaeology, §514. He further states, that as to a differ-

ence of situation in *Sheol*, in the opinion of the ancient Hebrews, it "cannot be proved by direct testimony." He adds, "We have not authority, therefore, decidedly to say, that any other motives were held out to the ancient Hebrews to pursue the good and to avoid the evil, than those which were derived from the rewards and punishments of this life."

Dr. Allen, President of Bowdoin college, in commenting on Ps. ix, 17, says: "The punishment expressed is cutting off from life, destroying from the earth, by some special judgment, and removing to the invisible state of the dead. The term [*sheol*] does not seem to mean with certainty any thing more than the state of the dead in their deep abode." Lect. on Univ. Salv.

The above are the opinions of men who strongly advocated the doctrine of endless punishment. In addition thereto I remark, that Ps. ix, is evidently a thanksgiving ode for victory and deliverance from the heathen, who had risen up against David. The theme is the Lord's judgments in the earth, coupled with a declaration, that the wicked and the heathen shall be "driven into *sheol*, i. e. pursued by victorious enemies till they are destroyed." Noyes' Translation, note on the passage in review.

Whoever will read Deut. xxxii, 22, with attention, will perceive that your exposition thereof is without authority.—"A fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest *sheol*, AND shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains. I will heap mischiefs upon them. . . . the day of their calamity is AT HAND," verse 35. No doubt this is strong figurative language, denoting the dreadful evils that should speedily come upon the Israelites for having forsaken the Lord, and broken his statutes.

I have not granted, nor do I allow, "that *paradise* in *hades* means a state of pure and perfect happiness." *Hades*, corresponding with *Sheol* of the Old Testament, signifies simply "the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery." Paul speaks of a man who had been "caught up into paradise," 2 Cor. xii, 4; and here I allow that the word signifies "a state of pure and perfect happiness"—but you will notice that it was not "a paradise in *hades*," the state of the dead, but "in the third heaven," to which the individual referred to, was caught up. Christ descended into *hades*, or as Paul expresses it, "into the lower parts of the earth," Eph. iv, 9. And if the paradise, mentioned in our Lord's address to the thief, be in *hades*, it must be somewhere in the bowels of this earthly ball. But I have yet to learn, that either Revelation or Natural philosophy, teaches the existence of a place or "state of pure and perfect happiness," in "the lower parts of the earth."

The same general remarks are applicable to *Tartarus* and *Gehenna*, both of which, you place in *hades*.

As to the word *Tartarus*, it occurs but once in the Bible—and for the want of parallel passages, we may not be enabled to determine precisely the meaning attached thereto, by the Apostle. You may, if you think proper, adopt the fables of heathen mythology, in relation to Tartarus—but in this case, you must receive the ridiculous stories of Ixion, Sisyphus, Tantalus, and others of the like character. And you must also search for this fabulous place of torment, not in the future state of being, but "within earth's spacious womb."

For mine own part, I profess to build my faith on the testimony of the Bible. Peter was instructed to "search the Scriptures," namely, of the Old Testament—and it is not reasonable to suppose, that he used the word *Tartarus* in any other sense, than that in which the word *Sheol* was used in "the law and the prophets."

You say "that the Holy Ghost introduced this *Tartarus* into the sacred oracles on purpose to refute the false doctrine that hell means nothing but the grave or the state of the dead." If this be true, then the Holy Ghost introduced a word into a single passage of the Bible, on purpose to contradict and refute all that had been written previously in relation to the state of the dead!

I have already quoted from Drs. Campbell, Jahn, and Allen—and I will add thereto, another citation from Campbell. He says, "In my judgment, it [the word *Hades*] ought never in Scripture to be rendered HELL, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians. . . . It is very plain, that neither in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, nor in the New, does the word *Hades* convey the meaning which the present English word *hell*, in the Christian usage, always conveys to our minds." He proceeds to say, as before quoted, that



the word in question signifies simply "the state of the dead," without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery." And I apprehend that Peter, in using the word *Tartarosa*, attached to it precisely the signification of *Sheol* or *Hades*.

I approve of much that you have written in relation to Gehenna. You are correct in your derivation of the word, and I thank you for having informed our readers that it primarily signified the Valley of Hinnom, which lay near Jerusalem. In this valley, sacrifices were offered to the Ammonitish idol, Moloch. It was subsequently defiled, being selected as the depot of the filth of Jerusalem. Here malefactors were put to death—worms were constantly feeding on putrid carcases, and a fire was continually kept burning to consume the filth. I might mention many particulars appertaining to this subject, which would perhaps be interesting and profitable to our readers—but a desire to be as brief as possible, admonishes me to forbear.

In my judgment, your argument in proof of endless punishment, drawn from the use of the word Gehenna, is very deficient, being based, as I shall proceed to show, in groundless suppositions.

After giving a brief but correct definition and description of the valley of Hinnom, you add, "It is evident from these passages that *Gehenna* was the name of a place of pollution, punishment, and the service of false and cruel gods. What more expressive or suitable term could have been chosen to denote the state of sin and misery and irreligion beyond the grave?" But you first take for granted that there is a "state of sin and misery and irreligion beyond the grave," and then inquire what more suitable term than Gehenna could have been chosen to denote that state. The reality must be proved, before the emblem can properly be chosen.

You continue: "The expression *Gehenna of fire*, was probably chosen to denote the punishment of hell, because of the fires employed in the service of Moloch, and the fires subsequently employed in burning the offals of Jerusalem." Here you assume the whole matter in debate, and then inform us, that "the expression *Gehenna of fire*, was probably chosen to denote" it. We should have nothing to do with probabilities but only with positive proofs.

I could select other portions of your remarks, to which similar exceptions might be taken—but the foregoing will answer the purpose for which they were introduced.

Your arguments are two in number. 1st. You quote Parkhurst, who says, "The Jews in our Savior's time used the compound word *Gehinnom for hell*, the place of the damned. And you add, "This appears from that word's being thus applied by several Jewish comments, called *Targums*, to which he [Parkhurst] refers." On this I remark, 1st. Jesus came "to fulfil the law and the prophets." He condemned the Scribes and Pharisees for having made void the law of God through their traditions. He continually quoted from the Old Testament, which is a key to the New. The meaning of words and phrases, as found in the New Testament, must be learned from the Old, and not from the opinions of the Jews, any farther than those opinions accorded with "the law and the testimony." In the Old Testament, the valley of Hinnom and every thing connected therewith, is used as an emblem of the temporal judgments coming upon the Jewish people. If you deny this statement, I will prove it. And I call upon you to adduce a single instance from the Old Testament, in which the valley of Hinnom is used as an emblem of any other than temporal judgments and punishments. But 2d. It remains to be shown that any Jewish *Targum* is of an earlier date than the second century of the Christian era. You will perceive, that your argument drawn from the usage of the word Gehenna in the *Targums*, is nothing to the purpose, if you fail to establish the position I have just disputed.

Your second argument is predicated of the language in Mark ix, 43—"Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not [or never shall be] quenched." Allusion here is unquestionably made to the fire and worms in the Valley of Hinnom. Our Lord quotes Isa. lvi, 24—"And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." I desire to repeat, that our Lord quoted this language in Mark ix, 43, et seq., on which passages you so confidently rely for proof of endless punishment. You will not dispute that the quotation from Isaiah referred to temporal punishments, and to temporal punishments alone. Why, then, should you apply the same language, when uttered by our Lord, to a future state of woe?

Concerning Idumea it is written, "The streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste." Isa. xxiv, 13.

Of Jerusalem it is recorded, "I will kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched." Jer. xvii, 27. Again: "Mine anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place, upon man, and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruit of the ground; and it shall burn, and shall not be quenched." Jer. vii, 20. See also Ezek. xx, 47, 48.

I need not inform you, that the above passages treat of things temporal and temporary—nor need I mention the bearing of the argument thus furnished.

In closing this letter, I will direct your attention to the following important facts, not one of which will be by you disputed.

1st. The word *Gehenna* occurs 12 times in the New Testament—7 times in Matthew, thrice in Mark, once in Luke, and once in James. Christ and James are the only persons who use the word.

2d. We have no evidence that the word *Gehenna* was ever used in addressing the *Gentiles*. John wrote his gospel for the use of the *Gentiles*—he does not record a syllable about *Gehenna*. Paul was emphatically the Apostle to the *Gentiles*—he preached thirty years and wrote fourteen epistles—yet the word in question does not occur in any of his writings. Why is this so, if the *Gentiles* had any concern in the matter?

3d. The word *Gehenna* was twice used by our Savior in addressing the unbelieving part of the Jewish nation. The remaining nine times it was used in addressing the disciples, and the disciples alone. Why is this so, if, according to your views, *Gehenna* signifies a state or place of endless punishment? Why should that word have been but twice used in addressing the unbelieving part of the nation?

I might add other facts, and propound other queries—but the foregoing will be found sufficient, if they are attended to; and if they are neglected, such would also be the fate of as much more as I might write.

It is of course understood that I consider you grossly in error, so far as your belief in endless punishment is concerned; and hope I shall give no offence when I say, that, in my judgment, your error in this respect is intimately connected with the error of the Sadducees. They supposed, as their conversation with our Savior clearly shows, that if there was a resurrection, mankind would there possess the same passions they possess in the present life. "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God," were the corrective instructions of the great Teacher.

Your general argument, I perceive, assumes that no renovation is to be effected by the power of the resurrection—or as popular opinion expresses the sentiment, "as death leaves us so judgment finds us; there is no change after death."—Hence you argue concerning the eternal destiny of any individual, from the condition in which he was when he died.—You inquire how he laid down in the grave and with what feelings and in what estate he departed this life. But in the days of Paul the queries were, "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" 1 Cor. xv, 35. The answer is given in the voice of inspiration: It is raised in incorruption, power, and glory; a spiritual body, in the image of the glorified Redeemer. "For as in Adam ALL die; EVEN SO in Christ shall ALL be made alive." And "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." 2 Cor. v, 17. It is written, "The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." It was in prospect of this great and glorious change, that the Apostle could HOPE for the resurrection even of THE UNJUST, Acts xxiv, 15. He surely could not have hoped for the resurrection of the unjust if he had believed they would be raised from the dead simply to suffer the unutterable pangs of endless torment! The doctrine of the Messiah was, "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Matt. xxii, 29, 30. In prospect of a resurrection of this glorious and sublime character, we may truly "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." And I feel confident, judging from your known benevolence and philanthropic views, that a consummation of the description referred to, must be peculiarly congenial to the feelings of your heart, even supposing it to be contrary to the convictions of your understanding.

Sincerely desiring that such a revolution may yet be effected in your sentiments, as will direct your acknowledged talents and influence to the proclamation and defence of what I esteem "the faith once delivered to the saints," I am affectionately yours, &c. ABEL C. THOMAS.

#### A REVIVALIST.

A communication in the Boston Trumpet from Philadelphia, Mass. speaking of Mr. Foot, (the celebrated revivalist, we suppose,) states that while he was in Athol, he said, in allusion to an elderly lady who refused to come forward to the anxious seat at his call—"I flung Jesus Christ into the pew where she sat, and she was not able to withstand him—she immediately left her pew and came to the anxious seat!" And there are those who can laud these kind of proceedings as the perfection of religion! How has the gold changed, and the fine gold become dim! P.

An error occurred in the letter of Br. Thomas in our last—7th page, 1st column, 12th line from bottom, for "total abstinence," read "total absence of authority," &c.

The individual who dates from Philadelphia and who is making himself conspicuously mean in his anonymous scribbles addressed to this office, is informed that he entirely fails in his object, if that object is to subject us to postage. The P. O. Department countenances no such imposition. And he must have a grovelling disposition, indeed, to derive any satisfaction therefrom himself.

#### OBITUARY.

Died, in Orange N. J. on the 22d ult. J. B. Williams, M. D. aged 32 years. Dr. Williams was a native of Orange and it was permitted him to die under the paternal roof, and among his kindred. For several years he had been engaged in the practice of medicine in Newark, Orange, and for the last year, in the city of New York. He was possessed of a vigorous mind that often disdained the beaten track of common thinkers and endeavored to strike out new paths for itself. He was naturally of rather a speculative turn and frequently indulged the propensity. Toward the close of his life he is said to have regretted the waste of time and intellect which it occasioned.

For several years it seems he had suffered under the influence of consumption which was to other eyes imperceptibly preying upon him and drying up the springs of life. He seldom complained. The disease from which he was suffering had already hurried two or three of his father's family to the grave and he seemed to feel that his own fate was sealed. He had been at times supposed by his friends to be hypochondriacal. It would not be singular if he were so. But it was the result of disease alone for he was naturally of a cheerful disposition. Until within a few weeks of his death he had attended as usual to his business, and those most familiar with him had no apprehensions of so speedy an exit. He found himself suddenly failing however and was in a few days removed from N. York to Orange, where it was hoped a purer air might in some degree restore him. For a little while the expectation was realized, but the energies of life were expended and he suddenly sunk into an untimely grave. He died in the faith of the Gospel, leaving behind him to mourn his loss, an affectionate wife, two sons now in their childhood, and a large circle of relatives and friends. May the God of grace minister all needed consolation to the afflicted, and be the Father of the fatherless and the widow's God. S.

#### Died,

In Plymouth, Mass. on the 10th inst. Rev. James H. Bugbee, a highly esteemed preacher of the final reconciliation.

#### Religious Notices.

Br. A. Case will preach in Trumbull on Sunday, the first day of June—at Stratford in the evening, and at Bridgeport on Monday evening, 2d June next.

#### Rayner's Lectures.

Just received and for sale at this office, Rayner's Lectures, comprising nine lectures on the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, (noticed a few weeks since in the Messenger,) price 50 cents.

#### Balfour's Reply to Whitman.

Just received and for sale at this Office Balfour's Reply to Whitman on the term Gehenna. Price 25 cents.



Original.

**A MOTHER'S LOVE.**

Give her the living child and in no wise slay it. 1 Kings iii, 26.

Oh spare the babe! let not its blood  
The sword of justice stain,  
Nor let a wretched mother's voice  
For mercy plead in vain.

Sweet innocent! if thou art safe,  
Thy mother's wish be blest,  
Though cradled in a stranger's arms.  
And pillowed on her breast.

I'll anxious watch thy every want,  
Thy infant woes beguile,  
Thou still shall share a mother's care,  
If not a mother's smile.

And when to years maturer grown,  
I'll bring the truth to view,  
And thou shalt read a mother's heart  
And know her tale was true.

Then wilt thou shed the filial tear,  
Impart the filial kiss,  
And I once more shall own a son,  
And taste a mother's bliss.

Then spare my child! let not its blood  
The sword of justice stain,  
Nor let a wretched mother's voice,  
For mercy plead in vain.

C. F. L. F.

[We extract the following from one of a series of numbers now publishing in the New-York Mirror, under the title of the "Minute-Book, a series of familiar letters from abroad," by Theodore S. Fay, one of the editors of the Mirror, who is now travelling in Europe. The number from which we copy is occupied with reflections on the writers passage to Europe, and our extract commences at the period of the voyage, just before land was descried, on their approach to the Straits of Gibraltar. We shall probably continue extracts from the same number in our next. The writer has a happy facility of expressing himself, and we doubt not the extracts will be acceptable to the readers of our miscellaneous department.] P.

Rose before day: air mild and sweet; morning lovely, and sky delicious. As the light dawned, a number of sails appeared in sight, and "land, ho!" greeted my ears. It lay on our south, a dark, mountainous ridge, painted boldly against the golden eastern light. Imagine my sensations, at this first glance at Capes Trafalgar and Sparte. It was Europe. It was Africa. It was the old world lying dimly along the horizon—a cloud—a shadow—a dream.—We had scarcely, however, delivered ourselves of the reflections and expressions usual on such occasions, and before I could get any of them to paper, when, lo! as the sun rose higher, Europe began to rise too, and was presently followed by Africa, which rolled slowly up the heavens, with most provoking indifference. So vanish the hopes of many an enthusiast—the systems of many a philosopher. Trafalgar is at this moment hanging over my head, in the shape of a pretty cloud; and Sparte, after sailing off gracefully to the south, and changing into a sea-dragon, has fairly melted away into thin air. These phenomena occurred several hours ago, and I now once more hear the cry of "land!"—but I shall suspend my admiration till I am certain this will not end, like the last, in smoke. The thrillings of sentiment, and the impulses of fancy, are rather too valuable to be wasted on empty vapour. They may be thus all spent in trifles; so that, when the proper period arrives, my stock will be exhausted: as a spendthrift, who squanders his wealth prematurely, in idle joys and deceitful speculations—when the time arrives for using it advantageously, finds himself a beggar.

We have just come in sight of land. The vast Atlantic is crossed at last. On one side lies Europe; on the other Africa; and between, the famed gates—that celebrated sea which washes

the shores of Palestine and Egypt, which breaks by the ruins of Rome, which tossed the ships of Æneas—where Æolus poured his winds, and Neptune rolled his car. The sea now bends about us gently as a summer lake. The afternoon is bright, still, and soft, and not a cloud in heaven but yonder pile above the land, their snowy summits half drowned in light. All nature is hushed into peaceful beauty. The shores, towards which no breeze but a slowly strengthening current is gently heaving us, is yet visible only as two blue points lying soft and dim in the far silver mist, a faint spell to be fraught with so many noble associations. Behind that hazy cloud, what scenes have been acted! what ages of wild and fearful interest have rushed on and rolled away! what empires, kingdoms, and republics have risen and fallen! what tremendous fragments of human life have been thrown into the "dark backward, and abyss of time!" Spain, France, Rome, Carthage, Greece, Asia. The sublime past! And all now more dreamlike than the shadowy image on which I gaze. But the present! What struggles and turmoil are even now going on in the arena to which you narrow outlet leads! While approaching it, as I do now, in the summer calmness of this delicious day, with but an indistinct idea of what lies behind. I feel like a child, for the first time, in the boxes of a theatre, gazing upon the curtain yet undrawn, and agitated with a pleasing anxiety to witness the wonders which it hides from his view. I have all my life looked anxiously forward to the moment when I should behold the old world. It is come. It is gone. This little era in my life has passed, and is now sacred to memory, instead of hope and imagination.

Not a breeze stirs the air, or breaks the sleep of the water. The sun has gone magnificently down towards our western home, leaving behind him a heaven of radiant light. The sails hang motionless against the mast. Ah! this is an hour to talk of hereafter. How we have wished for you all to share its deep enjoyment!

[We find in one of our exchange papers the following relation of a most touching scene, said to have occurred in Harlaem during the cholera season. There is no credit attached to the article, hence we know not its origin. It is emphatically a "thrilling" narration, and most strikingly exhibits the pure feelings and affection (even in the last struggle with the destroyer,) of the virtuous and devoted wife.]

**THE THRILLING TOKEN.**

In the cholera season, in the village of Harlaem, near the city of New-York, the Rev. G. L. Hinton, an excellent, warm-hearted, classical and pious clergyman of the Episcopal Church, and his lovely wife, were both on their death beds, brought down by the pale destroyer. They were in separate rooms, and when the interesting lady found her soul taking wing to the better world, she took off her wedding ring, and sent it to her dying husband as a last token.

The delicate and beautiful emotion of heart which prompted the beloved wife, when in the agonies of death, to return her wedding ring to the dear one from whom she received it, is too holy and sublime to be fully appreciated except by kindred minds. This act was a most solemn and precious farewell. Its language was this:—Take this token, the dearest gift that was ever committed to my keeping by earthly hands. I have kept it in my hours of joy and sorrow, and whenever I looked upon it a flood of love and refined affections would rush upon my heart. The death chill is now upon the hand which it has adorned. These eyes cannot longer rest upon it, and see its pure, yet simple brightness. I return it to thee, the dearest object of my earthly affections, with all its valued

associations. I go where earthly ties are changed to a more holy intensity—where all is spirit and the bright empire of unclouded thought and mind. I drop the ring in my upward flight. I could not carry the most precious gems of earth any further. I bequeath it to one who may longer tarry, as my last token of unchanged and undying love—farewell.

Well might the affectionate husband, as he received the expressive token have bowed as he did upon his bed, and prayed that as they had been one in life, they might be undivided in death! He took the ring, which is the last of earthly things from which a wife may part, and as it touchingly spoke of a thousand tender scenes—of duty done—of life ended—the mystic ring wedded him to the dead, and it was the token of reunion—the dim pledge of joys too bright to be shadowed by earthly symbols—too pure to be longer enjoyed beneath the cloudy atmosphere of time.

Her spirit lingered but a moment in the clouds, and her companion for time joined her for eternity.

**CLINTON LIBERAL INSTITUTE.**

The summer Term of the Male Department of the Liberal Institute, will commence on Wednesday the 28th of May, next. Tuition for common English branches, per Term, \$4.00. For the Latin Language, Algebra, Geometry, Surveying, Rhetoric, Chemistry and natural Philosophy, \$6.00. For the Greek, Hebrew, French, German and Spanish Languages, Astronomy, Moral Philosophy, &c., and the highest branches of Mathematics, \$8.00. Entrance money, fifty cents per Term; no other charges either for room rent or other purposes. No Student received for less than half a Term. One half of the Tuition bill, if required, to be paid in advance.

The young Ladies' School attached to the Institute is kept in a separate building, and will commence on Monday, the 12th of May next. Lowest price of Tuition, \$3.00 per Quarter; highest, \$5.00. Music, Drawing and French, extra charges. The scholars all board in private families; board and lodging, \$1.50.

JOSEPH STEBBINS,  
DAVID PIXLEY,  
TIMOTHY SMITH,  
JOHN W. HALE,  
E. S. BARNUM,

Executive Committee.

Clinton, April 5. 1834.

**NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER**

AND

**PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.**

The "N. Y. Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist," is published simultaneously in New-York and Philadelphia every Saturday morning, on a royal sheet, quarto form, and close print, at \$2 per annum, in advance, or \$2.50 if not paid within the first 6 months.

Subscribers in New-York and Philadelphia will be promptly served by carriers, and all possible care will be observed in the Mailing department, that subscribers may regularly receive their papers.

The publishing office in New-York is at No's. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham Square, and in Philadelphia, for the present, at No. 132 Chesnut-street adjoining the United States Bank.

P. PRICE. Publisher and Proprietor.

**Beauties of Arminio-Calvinism.**

Just published and for sale at this office, a neat 13 mo. pamphlet of 36 closely printed pages, entitled, "The Beauties of Arminio-Calvinism; or, the story of Deacon Caleb Comfort, to which is added the vision of Deacon Peter Pious." This pamphlet comprises the five articles which have recently appeared in the columns of the Messenger, under the head *Five chapters on Partialism*, and are designed to exhibit the change which has come over the Presbyterian denomination within a few years. Price \$4 per 100, or 6 cents single.

P. PRICE, PRINTER.

Nos. 2 and 3 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square